

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-68 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-7, 13-14, 19, 21, 30-33, 38, 40, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, and 61 are amended and claims 63-68 are added. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative at the January 8, 2008 personal interview. The points discussed are incorporated herein.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 5-17, 19, 20, 24-29, 31-36, 38, 39, 43-48, and 50-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hetzler, U.S. Patent No. 5,954,820. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, adjusting the brightness of the display screen when in the IDLE mode based on processor usage without turning the display screen off. Independent claims 13-14 and 31-33 have been similarly amended. As agreed at the January 8 personal interview, Hetzler does not disclose or suggest such features.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 13-14, and 31-33 should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 5-12, 15-17, 19-20, 24-29, 34-36, 38, 39, 43-48, and 50-62, as well as added claims 63-68, are allowable over Hetzler in view of their respective dependency on independent claims 1, 13-14, and 31-33, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 18 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hetzler in view of Zenda, U.S. Patent No. 5,386,577. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 18 and 37 are allowable over Hetzler at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 14 and 33, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Zenda is cited merely for allegedly teaching determining whether a system is powered by an internal power source, and thus, does not overcome the deficiencies of Hetzler. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 18 and 37 over Hetzler and Zenda should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 3, 21, 22, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hetzler in view of McFedries (Windows 98 Unleashed, May 12, 1998). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 2-3, 21-22, and 40-41 are allowable over Hetzler at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 33, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. McFedries fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hetzler, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching determining information is contained in a registry. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-3, 21-22, and 40-41 over Hetzler and McFedries should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 4, 23, 30, 42, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hetzler in view of Kardach, U.S. Patent No. 6,018,803. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 4, 23, 30, 42, and 49 are allowable over Hetzler at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 33, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Kardach fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hetzler, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching determining whether a video process related keyword is contained in a currently operating process (re claims 4, 23, and 42) and wherein the monitoring step comprises determining whether a video process related keyword is contained in a currently operating process (re claims 30 and 49). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 4, 23, 30, 42, and 49 over Hetzler and Kardach should be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **09/853,668**


Docket No. **P-0216**

Amendment dated February 1, 2008

Reply to Office Action of August 6, 2007

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzwick  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

703 766-3777 CLD:tlg

**Date: February 1, 2008**

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-077\146777.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**